



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,035	09/26/2001	John Joseph Mazzitelli	10015523-1	9875

7590 02/22/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CARDONE, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,035

Applicant(s)

MAZZITELLI, JOHN JOSEPH

Examiner

Jason D Cardone

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims disclose a request comprising an implied mask but then inserting the implied mask into the request.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carr, USPN 6,301,617.

6. Regarding claim 8, Carr discloses a system for automatically forwarding a request, comprising: a server in a network, the server operable to receive a request over the network from a client enabled to communicate using an Internet communications protocol, the request comprising at least a first portion [ie. virtserv, Carr, col. 3, lines 36-66, col. 5, lines 1-16 and col. 7, lines 53-65];

an automatic forwarding application resident on the server and operable to transform the request if the request is associated with a desired URL address that comprises the at least a first portion and another portion [Carr, col. 4, lines 1-11, col. 5, lines 17-47 and col. 7, lines 53-65]; and automatically forward the request to the desired URL address [Carr, col. 4, lines 24-26, col. 7, lines 53-65 and col. 8, lines 60-67].

7. Regarding claim 9, Carr further discloses the request comprises a mask and the application is further operable to transform the request by replacing the mask with a substitutable portion in the request [Carr, col. 3, lines 36-59 and col. 7, lines 1-18].

8. Regarding claim 10, Carr further discloses the client is a wireless device [Carr, col. 4, lines 27-35].

9. Regarding claim 11, Carr further discloses the application comprises one of a plurality of receivers in the server, the receivers each operable to receive and transfer requests using a unique protocol [Carr, col. 6, lines 5-18 and col. 7, lines 1-18].

Art Unit: 2145

10. Regarding claim 14, Carr further discloses the request specifies an HTML-enabled web page [Carr, col. 1, lines 15-37].

11. Regarding claim 15, Carr further discloses the Internet communications protocol comprises HTTP [Carr, col. 1, lines 45-51].

12. Regarding claims 1, 2, 4-7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 23, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 have similar limitations as claims 8-11, 14 and 15. Therefore, they are rejected under Carr for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 8-11, 14 and 15 [Supra 8-11, 14 and 15].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 3, 12, 13, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr as applied to claims 1, 8 and 16 above, and further in view of Kirsch et al. ("Kirsch"), USPN 6,466,966.

15. Regarding claim 12, Carr discloses CGI [Carr, col. 1, lines 52-65] but does not specifically disclose at least one class implemented by employing the language distributed under the name JAVA. However, Kirsch, in the same field of endeavor,

Art Unit: 2145

discloses JAVA [Kirsch, col. 14, lines 1-67]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate JAVA, taught by Kirsch, into the URL redirect system, taught by Carr, in order to efficiently redirect hyperlinks.

16. Regarding claim 12, Carr discloses masks but does not specifically disclose the request comprises an implied mask and the application is further operable to transform the request by inserting the implied mask into the request. However, Kirsch, in the same field of endeavor, discloses implied mask [Kirsch, col. 8, line 46 – col. 9, line 12]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate implied masking, taught by Kirsch, into the URL redirect system, taught by Carr, in order to efficiently redirect external server hyperlinks.

17. Regarding claims 3, 18 and 21, claims 3, 18 and 21 have similar limitations as claims 12 and 13. Therefore, they are rejected under Carr-Kirsch for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 12 and 13 [Supra 12 and 13].


Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason D Cardone whose telephone number is (571) 272-3933. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thu. (6AM-3PM).

Art Unit: 2145

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Martin-Wallace can be reached on (571) 272-6159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jason D Cardone
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2145

February 18, 2005